physica status solidi, 30 September 2012

arXiv:1210.0185v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 30 Sep 2012

Instability of the chiral phase and electronic ferroelectricity in the extended Falicov–Kimball model

D. I. Golosov[*,1]

[1] Department of Physics and the Resnick Institute, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan 52900, Israel

Received XXXX, revised XXXX, accepted XXXX
Published online XXXX

Key words: chiral phase, excitonic insulator, Falicov–Kimball model, electronic ferroelectricity.

---

[*] Corresponding author: e-mail Denis.Golosov@biu.ac.il

We consider a spinless extended Falicov–Kimball model at half-filling, for the case of opposite-parity bands. Within the Hartree–Fock approach, we calculate the excitation energies in the chiral phase, which is a possible mean-field solution in the presence of a hybridisation. It is shown that the chiral phase is unstable. We then briefly review the accumulated results on stability and degeneracies of the excitonic insulator phase. Based on these, we conclude that the presence of both hybridisation and narrow-band hopping is required for electronic ferroelectricity.

1 Introduction. In the mixed-valence regime of the extended Falicov–Kimball model (EFKM)[1], an excitonic insulator state is found within a broad range of parameter values[2,3,4,5,6]. When the two carrier bands involved (itinerant and nearly-localised) have opposite parities, a spontaneous electric polarisation (electronic ferroelectricity[7]) arises, provided that the off-diagonal excitonic average value $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$ (induced hybridisation) is uniform and has a non-vanishing real part[2,3,7]. With the experimental search for electronic ferroelectricity underway[8], it is important to achieve a better theoretical understanding of this phenomenon.

One of the issues that needs clarification is the possibility of the chiral phase, characterised by a uniform imaginary $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle = \mathrm{i}\varDelta$ in the EFKM with a non-zero bare hybridisation. While not found on numerical[3] and mean-field[9] phase diagrams, this phase was reported to be stable in a one-dimensional EFKM with specific parameter values in the limit of strong interaction[10]. Below, we will address this issue within the Hartree–Fock approximation by considering the stability of the chiral phase with respect to collective excitations.

The issue of stability of the ferroelectric state is further complicated by possible degeneracies of the excitonic insulator phase[2,3,11]. In a real system, the electrostatic dipole-dipole interaction will tend to minimise the spontaneous polarisation $\mathbf{P}$, with the result that a $\mathbf{P} = 0$ state will be selected whenever such a state appears among the degenerate ground states. This can be easily overcome by applying an external electric field $\mathbf{E}$, yet the net result is that spontaneous polarisation vanishes exactly (as opposed to a ferroelectric, where it may vanish only on average due to domain formation). This will be further discussed towards the end of the paper.

The Hamiltonian of the spinless Falicov–Kimball model (FKM) is given by

$$\mathcal{H} = -\frac{t}{2}\sum_{\langle ij \rangle}\left(c_i^\dagger c_j + c_j^\dagger c_i\right) + E_d \sum_i d_i^\dagger d_i + U \sum_i c_i^\dagger d_i^\dagger d_i c_i \,. \tag{1}$$

Here, the operator $d_i^\dagger$ ($c_i^\dagger$) creates an electron in the localised (itinerant) band, E_d is the bare energy of the localised electrons, and U is the on-site repulsion. It will be assumed that the hopping amplitude t and the period of the (d-dimensional hypercubic) lattice are equal to unity. We will consider the half-filled case (one electron per site) at zero temperature.

While the excitonic mean field solution is present already for the pure FKM[12], Eq. (1), it is always unstable unless the FKM is extended by a small but finite[4,11,13] perturbation $\delta\mathcal{H}$. For the case of opposite-parity bands we write in the momentum space,

$$\delta\mathcal{H} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left\{ t'\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} d^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}} d_{\mathbf{k}} + \mathrm{i}V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}} \left(c^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}} d_{\mathbf{k}} - d^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}} \right) \right\} \,, \tag{2}$$

with $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = -\sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} \cos k_\alpha$ and $\lambda_{\mathbf{k}} = -\sum_{\alpha=1}^{d} \sin k_\alpha$. Here, t' is the hopping amplitude in the narrow band, and the nearest-neighbour hybridisation is denoted V_2, consistent with Ref. [11]. We will now proceed with analysing the stability of the chiral state.

2 Instability of the chiral state. The Hartree-Fock mean field equations for the excitonic chiral state in the model Eq. (1–2) read:

$$\varDelta = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \varDelta'_{\mathbf{k}} \,, \;\; \varDelta'_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv -\mathrm{i}\langle c^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle = \frac{U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}}}{\sqrt{(\xi_{\mathbf{k}} + t'\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}})^2 + 4(U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}})^2}} \tag{3}$$

for the hybridisation, whereas for the narrow-band occupancy one finds:

$$n_d = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} n^{d\,\prime}_{\mathbf{k}} \,, \;\; n^{d\,\prime}_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \langle d^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\xi_{\mathbf{k}} + t'\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}{2\sqrt{(\xi_{\mathbf{k}} + t'\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}})^2 + 4(U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}})^2}} \,, \tag{4}$$

where $\xi_{\mathbf{k}} = E_{rd} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $E_{rd} = E_d + U(1 - 2n_d)$. The notation $\varDelta_{\mathbf{k}}$ ($n^d_{\mathbf{k}}$) is reserved for the leading-order terms in $\varDelta'_{\mathbf{k}}$ ($n^{d\,\prime}_{\mathbf{k}}$), corresponding to $V_2 = t' = 0$, and is consistent with Ref. [11].

The mean-field parameters $\varDelta$ and n_d, found from Eqs. (3–4), determine the quasiparticle dispersion in the filled and empty bands,

$$\varepsilon^{(1,2)}_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{2}\left\{ E_d + (1 + t')\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + U \mp \sqrt{(\xi_{\mathbf{k}} + t'\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}})^2 + (4U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}})^2} \right\} \,. \tag{5}$$

We see that in the chiral phase, $\varepsilon^{(1,2)}_{\mathbf{k}} \neq \varepsilon^{(1,2)}_{-\mathbf{k}}$. We follow Ref. [11] in writing

$$\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left\{ F_+(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q})\, c^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}} d_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} + F_-(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q})\, d^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} + F_c(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q})\, c^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} + F_d(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q})\, d^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}} d_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} \right\} \tag{6}$$

for a generic particle-hole excitation, and perform Hartree–Fock decoupling in the secular equation, $[\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{q}}, \mathcal{H} + \delta\mathcal{H}] = \omega_{\mathbf{q}}\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{q}}$. This yields four linear equations for the amplitudes $F_i(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q})$, viz.,

$$\mathrm{i}(\omega - \xi_{\mathbf{k}} - t'\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}})F_+(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) + (U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}})F_c(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) - (U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}})F_d(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) = U\left[A_a(\mathbf{q}) + A_b(\mathbf{q})\right] \,, \tag{7}$$

$$\mathrm{i}(\omega + \xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} + t'\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}})F_-(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) + (U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}})F_c(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) - (U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}})F_d(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) = U\left[A_a(\mathbf{q}) - A_b(\mathbf{q})\right] \,, \tag{8}$$

$$\mathrm{i}(U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}})F_+(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) + \mathrm{i}(U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}})F_-(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) + (\omega + \xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}})F_c(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) = UA_c(\mathbf{q}) \,, \tag{9}$$

$$-\mathrm{i}(U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}})F_+(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) - \mathrm{i}(U\varDelta + V_2\lambda_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}})F_-(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) + (\omega - t'\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} + t'\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}})F_d(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) = UA_d(\mathbf{q}) \,, \tag{10}$$

where the quantities $A_i(\mathbf{q})$ are defined self-consistently by

$$A_a(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2N}\sum_{\mathbf{p}} \left\{ \mathrm{i}\left[F_+(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}) - F_-(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})\right]\left(n^{d\,\prime}_{\mathbf{p}} + n^{d\,\prime}_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}} - 1\right) + \left[F_c(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}) - F_d(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})\right]\left(\varDelta'_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}} + \varDelta'_{\mathbf{p}}\right) \right\} \,, \tag{11}$$

$$A_b(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2N}\sum_{\mathbf{p}} \left\{ \mathrm{i}\left[F_+(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}) + F_-(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})\right]\left(\tilde{n}^{d\,\prime}_{\mathbf{p}} + \tilde{n}^{d\,\prime}_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}} - 1\right) + \left[F_c(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}) + F_d(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})\right]\left(\varDelta'_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}} - \varDelta'_{\mathbf{p}}\right) \right\} \,, \tag{12}$$

$$A_c(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{p}} \left\{ \mathrm{i}F_+(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})\varDelta'_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathrm{i}F_-(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})\varDelta'_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}} + F_d(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})\left[n^{d\,\prime}_{\mathbf{p}} - n^{d\,\prime}_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}}\right] \right\} \,, \tag{13}$$

$$A_d(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{p}} \left\{ -\mathrm{i}F_+(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})\varDelta'_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}} - \mathrm{i}F_-(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})\varDelta'_{\mathbf{p}} - F_c(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})\left[n^{d\,\prime}_{\mathbf{p}} - \tilde{n}^{d\,\prime}_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}}\right] \right\} \,. \tag{14}$$

We note the difference with Ref. [11], where the primary objective was to study the case of real $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$.

Solving Eqs. (7–10) for $F_i(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q})$ and substituting into Eqs. (11–14) yields a system of four homogeneous equations for $A_i(\mathbf{q})$. It is important to note that in the case of pure FKM, $V_2 = t' = 0$, the first of these equations is trivially satisfied at $\omega = 0$ (all the coefficients vanish), and the A_a-terms in the remaining equations disappear.

The excitations spectrum, $\omega_\mathbf{q}$, is found from the compatibility condition of the homogeneous system for $A_i(\mathbf{q})$ (zero determinant). We already mentioned that in the $V_2 = t' = 0$ case, the spectrum includes a branch which vanishes identically[11], $\omega_\mathbf{q} \equiv 0$. Physically, this is due to the local continuous degeneracy of the excitonic insulator in the pure FKM[1,14]. This degeneracy is lifted by a small perturbation, Eq. (2), and the resultant low-energy branch of the spectrum can be obtained by expansion to first order in t' and to second order in V_2 and ω. We obtain the following equation for the spectrum:

$$D_\omega(\mathbf{q}) \cdot \left(\frac{\omega}{U\Delta}\right)^2 + M_{11}(\mathbf{q}) \cdot D_0(\mathbf{q}) + + V_2^2 F(\mathbf{q}) + \frac{\omega V_2}{U\Delta} G(\mathbf{q}) = 0\,. \tag{15}$$

Here, the quantities $D_\omega(\mathbf{q})$ and $D_0(\mathbf{q})$ are defined as in Ref. [11] (where their momentum dependence is also discussed), whereas

$$M_{11} = \frac{t'(d+\epsilon_\mathbf{q})}{U\Delta^2 N d} \sum_\mathbf{k} \epsilon_\mathbf{k} n_\mathbf{k}^d + \frac{V_2^2}{N} \sum_\mathbf{k} \frac{4U\lambda_\mathbf{k}^2}{(\xi_\mathbf{k}^2 + 4U^2\Delta^2)^{3/2}} - - \frac{V_2^2}{U\Delta^2 N} \sum_\mathbf{k} \frac{(\lambda_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \lambda_\mathbf{k})^2}{\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_\mathbf{k}} n_\mathbf{k}^d. \tag{16}$$

Whilst the first term in M_{11} is the same as in the case of a real $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$, considered in Ref. [11], the terms which contain V_2 differ, reflecting the difference in the hybridised bandstructure. Furthermore, two new terms arise in Eq. (15), viz., the third term, containing an off-diagonal determinant F, and the last term, which is proportional to ωV_2 and odd in momentum, $G(\mathbf{q}) = -G(-\mathbf{q})$. The latter term is due to the imaginary $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$ breaking the inversion symmetry of the quasiparticle bands, Eq. (5). This in turn leads to breaking the symmetry of the collective excitation spectrum, $\omega_\mathbf{q} \neq \omega_{-\mathbf{q}}$, as follows from Eq. (15). While suppressing the lengthy explicit expressions for $F(\mathbf{q})$ and $G(\mathbf{q})$, we note that both quantities contain integrals of the form

$$\frac{1}{2N} \sum_\mathbf{k} \frac{\lambda_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \lambda_\mathbf{k}}{\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_\mathbf{k}} \left[f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}) - f(\xi_\mathbf{k}) \right] \,,$$

and therefore vanish at $\mathbf{q} \to 0$, as does the last term in Eq. (16).

For our immediate purposes, it is sufficient to notice that at $\mathbf{q} = 0$ one obtains

$$\left(\frac{\omega_\mathbf{q}}{U\Delta}\right)^2 = -\frac{D_0(\mathbf{q})}{D_\omega(\mathbf{q})} \cdot \frac{4UV_2^2}{N} \sum_\mathbf{k} \frac{\lambda_\mathbf{k}^2}{(\xi_\mathbf{k}^2 + 4U^2V_2^2)^{3/2}} < 0\,, \tag{17}$$

where we used the fact[11] that both D_0 and D_ω are negative at $\mathbf{q} = 0$. Equation (17), which holds whether t' vanishes or not, guarantees that the chiral state is unstable at small $V_2 \neq 0$.

The origin of this instability is different from that of the instability which arises[11] in the excitonic insulator state of the EFKM in the leading order in $t' < 0$. The latter instability is due to a sign change in $D_0(\mathbf{q})$ as $\mathbf{q}$ varies from $\mathbf{q} = 0$ to $\mathbf{q} = \{\pi, \pi(, \pi)\}$; taking into account the next-order (in t') terms leads to a substitution $D_0 \to D_0 + D_1$. When the value of $|t'|$ is not too small, $-t' > |t'_{cr}|$, the quantity $D_0(\mathbf{q}) + D_1(\mathbf{q})$ remains negative for all $\mathbf{q}$, resulting in a stabilisation of the excitonic insulator at $V_2 = 0$. We note that in this $V_2 = 0$, $t' < 0$ case the calculations of Ref. [11] remain valid whether $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$ is real or imaginary, owing to exact symmetry of the EFKM mean-field Hamiltonian with respect to the phase of $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$ [2,3].

In the $V_2 \neq 0$ case, on the other hand, the instability of the chiral state, Eq. (17), arises due to the sign of the V_2-containing terms in the system of equations for A_i (i. e., to M_{11}, rather than D_0, being of the “wrong” sign at small $\mathbf{q}$). Hence even for $-t' > |t'_{cr}|$, when the spectrum of the excitonic insulator state with imaginary $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$ is stable for $V_2 = 0$, including an arbitrary small V_2 leads to an instability [since the first term on the r. h. s. of Eq. (16) vanishes at $\mathbf{q} = 0$]. This situation is therefore expected to persist also when the higher-order (in V_2) terms are taken into account. We conclude that within the Hartree–Fock approach, the chiral state should remain unstable at least as long as the effects of V_2 can be treated perturbatively.

3 Conditions for electronic ferroelectricity.

We begin with the case of $t' < 0$ and $V_2 = 0$. Away from the symmetric case $E_d = 0$, the excitonic insulator state is stabilised in the mixed-valence regime[2,3,4,5], provided[4, 11] that $|t'|$ is not too small, $-t' > |t'_{cr}(E_d)|$. A Goldstone mode is present at $\mathbf{q} = 0$, corresponding to the $U(1)$ degeneracy of the Hamiltonian[2,3]. The associated fluctuations do not destroy the long-range order in three dimensions. However, as mentioned in the Introduction, the electrostatic dipole-dipole interaction (assumed weak) will stabilise the state with a uniform imaginary $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$, characterised by zero polarisation. Applying a small electric field $\mathbf{E}$ would suffice to make $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$ real and saturate $\mathbf{P}$. The system will therefore possess a large dielectric constant, but would not show ferroelectricity.

In two dimensions the EFKM, Eqs. (1–2) with $V_2 = 0$, does not support the excitonic long-range order owing to the Mermin–Wagner theorem[3]. At $\mathbf{E} = 0$, the dipole-dipole interaction will restore the long-range order (again with imaginary $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$, hence $\mathbf{P} = 0$) for $-t' > |t'_{cr}|$, and below a certain low critical temperature T_{dd}.

In the $t' = 0$, $V_2 \neq 0$ case, the excitonic insulator state can be stabilised in three dimensions (in agreement with Ref. [7]), provided[11] that $|V_2| > V_{2,cr}(E_d)$. Moreover, a uniform imaginary $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$ corresponds to the (unstable) chiral state and therefore would not be selected. However at least within the mean field description there is a Goldstone mode surviving at $\mathbf{q} = \{\pi, \pi(, \pi)\}$, with an associated ground-state degeneracy as discussed in Ref.[11]. The effect of the dipole-dipole interaction at $\mathbf{E} = 0$ will be that $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$ will order in a checker-board fashion, and will be imaginary: $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle = \pm \mathrm{i} \varDelta$. Thus, the behaviour of $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{E})$ will be much like in the $t' < 0$, $V_2 = 0$ case. This is at variance with Ref. [7], where the effects of electrostatic dipole-dipole interaction were not discussed.

Finally, in the $V_2 \neq 0$, $t' < 0$ case the excitonic insulator state with real $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$ can be stabilised, provided that at least one of $|V_2|$ and t' is not too small[11]. There are no Goldstone modes, and as demonstrated above the chiral state (with a uniform imaginary $\langle c_i^\dagger d_i \rangle$) remains unstable at $t' \neq 0$. We conclude that in this case even with the electrostatic dipole-dipole interaction taken into account, the EFKM shows a proper electronic ferroelectricity, characterised by a non-vanishing spontaneous polarisation, $\mathbf{P} \neq 0$ at $\mathbf{E} = 0$. This is in agreement with earlier results[3], obtained for a two-dimensional model.

4 Summary. We verified that the chiral excitonic insulator state of the EFKM is unstable within the Hartree–Fock mean-field approach. Eliminating this possible candidate for the ground state allows to answer a general question about the possibility of electronic ferroelectricity. We find that the latter requires the presence of both hybridisation and narrow-band hopping. While a large dielectric constant can be obtained in other cases as well, the electrostatic dipole interactions preclude the formation of a spontaneous polarisation in other cases. This is due to the degeneracies of the excitonic insulator state in these other cases.

Acknowledgements The writer takes pleasure in thanking R. Berkovits and K. A. Kikoin for discussions. This work was supported by the Israeli Absorption Ministry.

References

[1] J. K. Freericks and V. Zlatić, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 1333 (2003), and references therein.
[2] C. D. Batista, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 166403 (2002).
[3] C. D. Batista, J. E. Gubernatis, J. Bonča, and H. Q. Lin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 187601 (2004).
[4] P. Farkašovský, Phys. Rev. **B77**, 155130 (2008).
[5] G. Schneider and G. Czycholl, Eur. Phys. J. **B64**, 43 (2008).
[6] B. Zenker, D. Ihle, F. X. Bronold, and H. Fehske, Phys. Rev. **B81**, 115122 (2010).
[7] T. Portengen, Th. Östreich, and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** 3384 (1996); Phys. Rev. **B54**, 17452 (1996).
[8] C. Li, X. Zhang, Z. Cheng, and Y. Sun, Appl. Phys. Lett. **93** 152103 (2008); D. S. F. Viana, R. A. M. Gotardo, L. F. Cótica, I. A. Santos, M. Olzon-Dionysio, S. D. Souza, D. Garcia, J. A. Eiras, and A. A. Coelho, J. Appl. Phys. **110** 034108 (2011); P. Lunkenheimer, S. Krohns, S. Riegg, S. G. Ebbinghaus, A. Reller and A. Loidl, Eur. Phys. J. **ST180**, 61 (2010).
[9] B. Zenker, H. Fehske, and C. D. Batista, Phys. Rev. **B82**,165110 (2010).
[10] L. G. Sarasua and M. A. Continentino, Phys. Rev. **B69**, 173102 (2004).
[11] D. I. Golosov, Phys. Rev. B, in press (2012) [preprint arXiv:1204.6499].
[12] A. N. Kocharyan and D. I. Khomskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **71**, 767 (1976) [Sov. Phys. JETP **44**, 404 (1976)]; H. J. Leder, Solid State Comm. **27**, 579 (1978); N. Sh. Izmailyan, A. N. Kocharyan, P. S. Ovnanyan, and D. I. Khomskii, Fiz. Tverd. Tela **23**, 2977 (1981) [Sov. Phys. Solid State **23**, 1736 (1981)].
[13] G. Czycholl, Phys. Rev. **B59**, 2642 (1999).
[14] V. Subrahmanyam and M. Barma, J. Phys. **C21**, L19 (1988).